

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-10 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enick et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,183,815). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that Enick teaches all of the features of the claimed invention, but teaches compressed liquid carbon dioxide instead of compressed carbon dioxide, as claimed. Notwithstanding Enick's teaching of compressed liquid carbon dioxide instead of the claimed compressed carbon dioxide, the Examiner alleges that the claimed invention would have been obvious because the use of compressed carbon dioxide would be well within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants, however, respectfully assert that the claimed invention's use of compressed carbon dioxide is not obvious in view of the teaching's of Enick. More particularly, Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has neglected the fact that carbon dioxide is a gaseous material under normal conditions, while the solvents disclosed in Enick are liquid materials under normal conditions. This contrasts with the claimed invention because to use carbon dioxide as a solvent according to the claimed invention, the carbon dioxide is compressed purposely.

Further, it should be noted that the use of compressed carbon dioxide, as claimed, produces a high pressure condition that is optimum for forming a self-assembled monolayer easily. This high pressure condition also leads to the production of a high quality self-assembled monolayer (i.e., a high density self-assembled monolayer). Enick does not contain any suggestion or motivation that the use of compressed carbon dioxide would provide these advantages. As such, the Examiner's assertion that the use of compressed carbon dioxide instead of the liquid carbon dioxide taught by Enick would be well within the level of ordinary skill is improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed invention would not have been obvious in view of Enick.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, therefore, is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 11-13 and 17-26 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants acknowledge, with thanks, the allowable subject matter of these claims. Notwithstanding, Applicants have elected not to amend the independent claims to include the allowable subject matter of these claims. This is because, as stated above, Applicants believe that the claimed invention is distinguishable from Enick.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec 30, 2004

By: _____

G. Gregory Schivley

Reg. No. 27,382

Bryant E. Wade

Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/JAH